REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **1 June 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. The specification was objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meffert et al., (US Appl. No. 2002/0059144, hereinafter "Meffert") in view of Liu (US Appl. No. 2002/0143710, hereinafter "Liu").

Objections to the specification

The specification was objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended paragraph [0026] to include application serial number and filing date.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over Meffert in view of Liu. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Meffert and Liu teaches using a digest and certificates to **authenticate users,** where users include both senders and receivers, and allows for direct data transmission (see Meffert Page 3, Paragraph 35, lines 1-11, see Meffert Page 6, Paragraph 64, lines 1-7, see Liu Page 1, Paragraph 6, Page 4, Paragraphs 36-38). Additionally, Meffert allows for unverified users (see Meffert Page 9, Paragraph 87).

In contrast, the present invention requires **verifying the identity** of both sender and receiver and maintaining a persistent record of all transactions. In this way, the sender cannot reasonably deny sending the content, where content is defined as the message, and the receiver cannot reasonably deny requesting the content (see paragraph [0033]-[0035] of the instant application). In doing so, the system uses a third party to keep a record of messages sent and messages requested, making it impossible for either user to deny its involvement in content

10

transfer. Furthermore, forcing all content transfers to occur through a third party increases the level of security in some sense because only verified recipients can obtain a copy of the message. Note that in a system designed in accordance with the teachings of Meffert, and Liu it is possible for users who have not been validated to obtain encrypted data. This is a potential problem because it is possible for the user to break the encryption surrounding a message and gain access to a message that the user does not have authorization to access. There is nothing disclosed in Meffert and Liu that will prevent this. In contrast, the present invention does not allow this to occur because the recipient must be validated before being sent the message.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to clarify that the present invention provides increased security and non-repudiation of both message origination and message receipt within a queuing system. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0008], [0009], and [0033]-[0035] of the instant application. Applicant has canceled claims 2, 9 and 16 without prejudice. Dependent claims 3, 5-7, 10, 12-14, 17, and 19-21 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8 and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 23 June 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665

12